VANCOUVER
JUL 15 2026
REGISTRY

No. 217586
Vancouver Registry

In the Supreme Court of British Columbia

Between

Action4Canada, Linda Morken, Gary Morken, Jane Doe, Ilona Zink, Valerie Ann Foley, Pastor Randy Beatty, Brittany Wilson

Plaintiffs

and

His Majesty the King in right British Columbia, His Majesty the King in right Canada. Prime Minister Justin Trudeau, Chief Public Health Officer Theresa Tam, Dr. Bonnie Henry, David Eby, Adrian Dix, Minister of Health, Mike Farnworth, Minister of Public Safety and Solicitor General Omar Alghabra, Minister of Transport, Vancouver Island Health Authority, The Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP), and the Attorney General of Canada, Peter Kwok, TransLink (British Columbia)

SCSS

Defendants

NOTICE OF APPLICATION

Names of applicants: His Majesty the King in right British Columbia, Dr. Bonnie Henry, David Eby, Adrian Dix, Mike Farnworth (collectively, the "**Province**")

To: Action4Canada, Linda Morken, Gary Morken, Jane Doe, Ilona Zink, Valerie Ann Foley, Pastor Randy Beatty, Brittany Wilson (the "**plaintiffs**")

TAKE NOTICE that an application will be made by the Province to the presiding judge or associate judge at the courthouse at 800 Smithe Street, Vancouver, BC on September 24, 2026, at 10 a.m. for the orders set out in Part 1 below.

The Province estimates that the application will take **1 day**.

This matter is within the jurisdiction of an associate judge.

Part 1: ORDERS SOUGHT

1. An order striking the amended notice of civil claim, pursuant to Rule 9-5(1), without leave to amend, and dismissing the action.

2. Costs.

3. Such other relief as this Honourable Court deems fit.

Part 2: FACTUAL BASIS

I. Notice of civil claim

4. On August 27, 2021, the plaintiffs filed a 391-page notice of civil claim to challenge the scientific and legal basis for the entirety of British Columbia and Canada's response to the COVID-19 pandemic (the "**original claim**"). In the original claim, the plaintiffs sought hundreds of declarations. The claim made sweeping allegations of conspiracy, sought rulings on questions of science, and alleged criminality in a civil pleading.

II. Notice of civil claim struck

5. On August 29, 2022, Justice A. Ross struck the original claim, with leave to amend. He held that the original claim was clearly prolix, unanswerable, and "bad beyond argument".[1] In *obiter*, Justice A. Ross identified numerous improperly pleaded aspects of the original claim, including non-justiciable declarations on questions of science, declarations of fact, and purported causes of action arising out of the *Criminal Code* and international law.[2] Finally, while Justice A. Ross declined to find that the original claim was an abuse of process, he held that "if the next iteration of [the civil claim] contains the same, or similar, problems, then the defendants' arguments on these issues will be strengthened."[3]

III. Appeal dismissed

6. The plaintiffs' appeal of Justice A. Ross' order was dismissed on February 23, 2024.[4] In oral submissions, the plaintiffs conceded that the claim was prolix.[5] Notwithstanding this concession, the plaintiffs nonetheless persisted in their appeal, arguing that Justice A. Ross erred in his *obiter* comments.[6] The Court of Appeal rejected the plaintiffs' position, stating that it "agree[d] entirely with the [defendants]" and that Justice A. Ross had "transparently and helpfully identified a number of areas of concern with the notice of civil claim."[7] The Court of Appeal found that Justice A. Ross had provided the plaintiffs "fair warning of the possible consequences" of filing another improper pleading.[8]

V. Amended notice of civil claim

7. On December 12, 2024, the plaintiffs served the amended notice of civil claim (the "**amended claim**"). While the footnotes and some inflammatory or conspiratorial

---

[1] *Action4Canada v. British Columbia*, 2022 BCSC 1507 [***Action4Canada SC***] at para. 45.
[2] *Action4Canada SC* at paras. 52-58.
[3] *Action4Canada SC* at para. 73.
[4] *Action4Canada v. British Columbia (Attorney General)*, 2024 BCCA 59 [***Action4Canada CA***].
[5] *Action4Canada CA* at para. 8.
[6] *Action4Canada CA* at para. 8.
[7] *Action4Canada CA* at para. 10.
[8] *Action4Canada CA* at para. 11.

language were removed, the claim is 54 pages long and seeks over 50 declarations—including declarations on issues of science, international law, and criminal law. The amended claim is essentially a repackaged version of the original claim and still fails to comply with the basic tenets of pleadings.

Part 3: LEGAL BASIS

I. The amended claim must be struck without leave to amend

(a) No reasonable cause of action (9-5(1)(a))

8. It is plain and obvious that the amended claim pleads causes of action with no prospect of success, fails to plead material facts, seeks declarations on non-justiciable questions, and pleads causes of action not known to law.

9. First, the amended claim advances numerous legal claims which are unsupported in law and bound to fail, including:

a. All claims for declaratory relief in respect of statutory orders by the Provincial Health Officer (the "**PHO**"), Dr. Bonnie Henry, arising out of the Notice of Regional Event under s. 52(2) of the *Public Health Act* or the Minister of Public Safety and Solicitor General's declared state of emergency under the *Emergency Program Act* are moot. The Notice of Regional Event, and thus any remaining public health orders, was rescinded in July 2024.[9] Likewise, the state of emergency expired on June 30, 2021.[10]

b. All claims for damages against Dr. Henry are bound to fail because s. 92 of the *Public Health Act* immunizes her from any claim for damages—including damages under s. 24(1) of the *Charter*.[11]

c. The plaintiffs seek declarations of constitutional principles which have no basis in law and are bound to fail, including:

   i. that "vaccination" is an analogous ground under s. 15 of the *Charter*;[12]

   ii. that the provincial legislature has no jurisdiction to regulate speech or

---

[9] See *e.g.*: Province's response to civil claim at para. 20; *Tatlock v. British Columbia (Attorney General)*, 2025 BCCA 181 at para. 5.

[10] See *e.g.*: Province's response to civil claim at para. 21; *Eliason v. British Columbia (Attorney General)*, 2022 BCSC 1604 at para. 16.

[11] *Weisenburger v. College of Naturopathic Physicians of British Columbia*, 2024 BCSC 1047 at paras. 106-123.

[12] Amended claim at para. 96. See: *Dorceus v. Ontario*, 2026 ONCA 321 [***Dorceus CA***] at para. 54, aff'ing 2024 ONSC 7087 [***Dorceus SC***]; *Lewis v. Alberta Health Services*, 2022 ABCA 359 at paras. 64-68.

assembly under s. 92 of the *Constitution Act, 1867*;[13]

iii. that s. 7 of the *Charter* imposes a "duty to consult" before public health measures are adopted;[14]

iv. that s. 7 of the *Charter* protects the right to practice in a chosen profession;[15]

v. that the provincial *Emergency Program Act* and orders made by the PHO under the *Public Health Act* are *ultra vires* provincial jurisdiction, as matters falling exclusive within federal jurisdiction; and[16]

vi. that regulations requiring proof of vaccination to enter public spaces during a pandemic constitute non-consensual medical treatment and violate s. 7 of the *Charter*.[17]

d. The plaintiff, Action4Canada, claims damages for purported violations of ss. 2(a), 6-7 and 15 of the *Charter*.[18] However, these *Charter* provisions do not apply to non-natural persons or corporations.[19] In any event, Action4Canada neither has public interest standing to advance such claims on behalf of non-parties, nor are material facts pleaded to establish such claims.

e. The claims of the plaintiffs, Jane Doe and Valerie Ann Foley, are not actionable against the Province.[20] Their claims relate entirely to the alleged actions of the defendant, TransLink, and a non-party, Providence Health Care Society.[21] Alternatively, even if TransLink and Providence Health Care Society were agents of the Crown (which is expressly denied), any claim against the Province arising from their actions are barred by s. 3(2)(d) of the *Crown Proceeding Act*.[22] In the further alternative, the Province cannot be held liable

---

[13] Amended claim at para. 96, 100. See: *Dupond v. City of Montreal et al.*, [1978] 2 S.C.R. 770 at 796-797.

[14] Amended claim at para. 97.

[15] Amended claim at para. 96. See: *Weisenburger* at paras. 88-89; *Dorceus CA* at para. 53.

[16] Amended claim at paras. 97-98. See: *Klassen v. British Columbia (Attorney General)*, 2021 BCSC 2254 at paras. 54-58.

[17] Amended claim at paras. 96, 101-103, 107, 110. See: *Weisenburger* at para. 89; *Dorceus SC* at paras. 96-130.

[18] Amended claim at para. 118.

[19] *Quebec (Attorney General) v. 9147-0732 Québec inc.*, 2020 SCC 32 at paras. 14-15; *O'Donnell v. Alberta (Minister of Justice)*, 2024 ABKB 268 at para. 14; *Nova-BioRubber Green Technologies Inc. v. Canada (National Research Council)*, 2024 BCSC 1501 at para. 50.

[20] Amended claim at paras. 2, 4, 118(b), (c).

[21] Providence Health Care Society operates St. Paul's Hospital. See: *Jonckeau v. British Columbia (Attorney General)*, 2026 BCCA 247 at para. 6.

[22] *Alter v. The University of British Columbia*, 2026 BCCA 253 at paras. 12, 59-63.

for the actions of physicians or other healthcare staff, as they are not employed by the Province.[23]

10. Second, the amended claim fails to plead a concise statement of material facts necessary to support any complete cause of action. The *Charter* claims are inextricably bound up in a prolix, argumentative, speculative, and evidence-laden narrative that is incapable of supporting a viable cause of action. The same is true for any claims on federalism grounds. It is impossible to separate the material from the immaterial or conjecture and conspiracy from asserted facts. Examples include:

a. At paras. 26-95, the amended claim sets out a conspiratorial narrative which seeks to impugn the entirety of British Columbia and Canada's response to COVID-19 pandemic. This includes: (i) inflammatory and speculative assertions with no basis in reality;[24] (ii) unsupported conclusions of law;[25] and (iii) evidence.[26]

b. The plaintiffs seek declarations that various unspecified "measures" or "orders" violate the *Charter*.[27] Similarly, the plaintiffs seek declarations that unspecified individuals or state actors violated various constitutional rights.[28] It is impossible for the defendants to understand who these allegations are against and what they are about.[29]

c. The plaintiffs seek bare declarations of law which are not supported by any material facts and are not related to any plaintiffs' circumstances.[30]

d. The plaintiffs seek declarations on the constitutional validity on provisions of the *Health Professions and Occupations Act* which are unsupported by any material facts.[31] While the amended claim pleads purported material facts in relation to Brittany Wilson,[32] these facts are wholly disconnected to the purported causes of action and relief sought.

11. Third, the plaintiffs seek declarations on non-justiciable questions of science, international law, or criminal law, including but not limited to:

a. that the *Health Professions and Occupations Act* "[b]reach[es] parallel

---

[23] *Brooks v. Thibeault*, 2025 BCSC 1693 at para. 15.

[24] Amended claim at paras. 29-30, 42, 49-50, 57-58, 61, 64, 65-69, 71, 74, 85-86, 94.

[25] Amended claim at paras. 35, 54, 62, 64, 93.

[26] Amended claim at paras. 37-38, 41, 43, 45-48, 51-52, 55-56, 63, 64, 70, 73, 75, 76-84, 89-94.

[27] Amended claim at paras. 97, 99-100, 103-104, 106-107, 109, 110, 113, 114, 117.

[28] Amended claim at paras. 100-103, 106-111, 113, 114-115, 117.

[29] *Dorceus SC* at paras. 55-56.

[30] Amended claim at paras. 97-117. See: *Dorceus CA* at paras. 26-36.

[31] S.B.C. 2022, c. 43, ss. 49(1)(b)(v) and 49(3)(f). Amended claim at para. 96.

[32] In any event, Ms. Wilson is <u>not</u> a plaintiff to this action, as the plaintiffs have attempted to improperly add her as a party via amendment.

international treaty right to no medical treatment without informed consent";[33]

b. "that administrating medical treatment without informed consent constitutes experimental medical treatment and is contrary to the *Nuremberg Code* and *Helsinki Declaration* of 1960";[34]

c. "that the mandatory masking of children violates... the Convention on the rights of the Child";[35] and

d. "that failure and/or refusal to comply with Provincial COVID-19 Measures does not constitute a 'common nuisance' contrary to s. 180 of the *Criminal Code* or constitute 'obstruct peace officer' contrary to s. 129 of the *Criminal Code*".[36]

e. That the unspecified provincial measures caused more deaths "at a ratio of deaths well above every death purportedly attributed to COVID-19."[37]

12. In addition, the plaintiff Randy Beatty seeks damages for an alleged, unspecified breach of s. 176 of the *Criminal Code*.[38] This is an improper pleading in a civil action.[39]

13. The amended claim therefore fails to set out a reasonable cause of action and is bound to fail. It must be struck under Rule 9-5(1)(a).

(b) Amended claim is scandalous, embarrassing, and frivolous (9-5(1)(b))

14. As stated in *Action4Canada SC*, a pleading is scandalous and embarrassing where it is "prolix, contain[s] argument, or fail[s] to state the real issue in an intelligible way".[40] This description applies with equal force to the amended claim:

a. While shorter than the original 391-page pleading, the amended claim remains prolix. In *Dorceus SC* and *Adelberg*,[41] the courts struck claims of nearly identical length for their prolixity.

b. As in the original claim, the amended claim is rife with unspecified allegations of illegality which are not directed at any particular defendant or supported by any material facts (*i.e.*, bare declarations regarding unspecified "orders" or "measures" impugning the conduct of unnamed government actors).[42] Such

---

[33] Amended claim at para. 96(a)(v)
[34] Amended claim at para. 101. See *Action4Canada SC* at para. 52(d).
[35] Amended claim at para. 115.
[36] Amended claim at para. 117(d).
[37] Amended claim at para. 100.
[38] Amended claim at para. 118.
[39] *Action4Canada SC* at paras. 52-53.
[40] *Action4Canada SC* at para. 34(a).
[41] *Adelberg v. Canada*, 2023 FC 252, var'd on other grounds 2024 FCA 106.
[42] Amended claim at paras. 97, 99-100, 103-104, 106-107, 109, 110, 113, 114, 117

indiscernible claims are indicative of a frivolous and vexatious claim.[43]

c. The plaintiffs attempt to improperly add a new plaintiff (*i.e.*, Ms. Wilson) and defendant (*i.e.*, Premier Eby) via amendment, rather than an application under Rule 6-2(7).[44]

15. The amended claim is also a scandalous and embarrassing pleading because it fails to meet the basic requirements under the *Rules*:

a. the amended claim fails to set out a concise statement of the material facts, relief sought, and legal basis, in violation of Rules 3-1(1)-(3);

b. the amended claim pleads evidence, in contravention of Rule 3-7(1);[45] and

c. the amended claim pleads conclusions of law, unsupported by facts, in contravention of Rule 3-7(9).[46]

16. Furthermore, the amended claim is frivolous because it is "without substance, is groundless, fanciful, [and] trifles with the court or wastes time".[47] For the reasons detailed above, the amended claim is groundless and wholly without substance. Moreover, the amended claim trifles with the court's time by promoting baseless conspiracy theories through unintelligible pleadings, as confirmed by this Court, the Court of Appeal, the Ontario Superior Court of Justice, the Court of Appeal for Ontario, the Federal Court, and the Federal Court of Appeal.

(c) Amended claim is an abuse of process (9-5(1)(d))

17. Courts retain wide discretion to dismiss claims as an abuse of process under Rule 9-5(1)(d). It is a flexible doctrine "directed to prevent actions that violate such principles as judicial economy, consistency, finality and the integrity of the administration of justice".[48] A claim may be abusive for several reasons, including:

a. it improperly seeks to challenge the legal effect of a statutory decision through an action, rather than through a petition for judicial review;[49]

b. it misuses the court's process by seeking to improperly conduct a wide-ranging, political inquiry into government policy without pleading any material facts;[50] or

---

[43] *Dorceus SC* at paras. 55-56.

[44] Rule 6-1(1); *Alexis v. Duncan*, 2015 BCCA 135 at paras. 13, 20.

[45] Amended claim at paras. 37-38, 41, 43, 45-48, 51-52, 55-56, 63, 64, 70, 73, 75, 76-84, 89-94.

[46] Amended claim at paras. 35, 54, 62, 64, 93.

[47] *Steritt v. Canada (Her Majesty the Queen)*, 2017 BCSC 1064 at para. 9.

[48] *Steritt* at para. 11.

[49] *Weisenburger* at paras. 28, 32.

[50] *Dorceus CA* at paras. 26-36.

c. it is part of a series of "multiple or successive related proceedings that are likely to cause vexation or oppression".[51]

18. The amended claim is an abuse of process on each of these bases.

19. First, it is a collateral attack on numerous (but inadequately defined) statutory decisions made under the *Public Health Act* and *Emergency Program Act*.[52]

20. Where a plaintiff seeks to set aside an order of a statutory decision-maker, the plaintiff must proceed by judicial review. Only where a plaintiff is content to let the order stand and instead seek compensation for alleged losses can they proceed by way of action.[53] However, if a plaintiff elects to proceed by way of action, they must plead a valid cause of action separate and apart from the alleged unreasonableness and/or unfairness of the impugned statutory decision.[54] Initiating a civil action instead of seeking judicial review will therefore constitute a collateral attack on a statutory decision in two instances, both of which apply here:

a. The claim is a collateral attack because it seeks to invalidate statutory decisions or avoid their consequences. Like *Weisenburger*, the declaratory relief sought by the plaintiffs are "direct challenges to [the statutory decisions'] legal force and effect."[55] Specifically, the amended claim seeks declaratory and mandatory relief (*i.e.*, *mandamus*) which directly challenge the legality of numerous statutory decisions and are only available on judicial review.[56]

b. The amended claim fails to plead a valid cause of action (as detailed above) and is essentially a claim for judicial review "with only a thin pretence to a private wrong."[57] The claim for *Charter* and tort damages "'does not bulletproof [the] claim from a motion to strike' where it is appropriately brought by way of judicial review".[58] Alleging legal wrongs which are the subject matter of judicial review and seeking damages for those alleged wrongs does not create a valid cause of action—it is a collateral attack.[59]

21. Second, the amended claim seeks over a dozen declarations which have no relationship to the plaintiffs' circumstances,[60] and instead essentially attempt to leverage the court's resources to conduct a public inquiry into the entirety of British Columbia's

---

[51] *Steritt* at para. 12.

[52] Amended claim at paras. 97-100, 103, 105-107, 116-117.

[53] *Weisenburger* at para. 35.

[54] *Weisenburger* at para. 35.

[55] *Weisenburger* at para. 46.

[56] Amended claim at paras. 97-100, 103, 105-107, 116; *Judicial Review Procedure Act*, R.S.B.C. 1996, c. 241, ss. 2, 12(2); *Lockyer-Kash v. British Columbia (Workers' Compensation Board)*, 2013 BCCA 459 at paras. 22, 26

[57] *Weisenburger* at para. 42.

[58] *Weisenburger* at para. 63.

[59] *Weisenburger* at paras. 60-68.

[60] Amended claim at paras. 97-115.

response to the COVID-19 pandemic. The Court of Appeal for Ontario found substantially similar pleadings to be abusive in *Dorceus CA*. The Court noted that the plaintiffs sought declarations that "the pandemic was fabricated... and that vaccines constitute crimes against humanity" but held that "[t]hese allegations are not tied to individualized facts concerning the appellants'... circumstances."[61] Rather, these allegations "were fatally flawed" because they were unsupported by any material facts and instead attempted "to transform the courtroom into what the motion judge aptly described as a 'grandstand" for political advocacy."[62] These comments are equally applicable here.

22. Third, the amended claim is an abuse of process because the plaintiffs are advancing similar frivolous claims to those that were struck in *Action4Canada SC* after being given "fair warning" by this Court and the Court of Appeal that such conduct may constitute an abuse of process.[63] This abusiveness is amplified by the fact that since the original claim was struck, the Ontario Superior Court of Justice, the Court of Appeal for Ontario, the Federal Court, and the Federal Court of Appeal have struck pleadings advancing similar arguments and filed by the same counsel. Many of the same allegations dismissed in the other actions—as well as the original notice of civil claim—are pleaded here, including:

a. extended recitations of "facts", wholly consisting of conspiracy theories about the efficacy of vaccination;[64]

b. allegations that "mandatory" vaccination violates ss. 2, 7, and 15 of the *Charter* and constitutes "medical experimentation", and which violate the *Nuremburg Code* and *Helsinki Declaration*;[65]

c. assertions that there is a "duty to consult" prior to enacting any public health measures;[66]

d. assertions that provincial emergency legislation is *ultra vires* and that any declarations made thereunder were unlawful;[67] and

---

[61] *Dorceus CA* at para. 30.
[62] *Dorceus CA* at paras. 32, 34.
[63] *Action4Canada CA* at para. 11.
[64] Amended claim at paras. 38-53. See also: Affidavit #1 of Jordan Hamilton, filed September 26, 2025 ("**Hamilton Affidavit**"), Ex. A (*Adelberg* statement of claim at paras. 35-51) and Ex. B (*Dorceus SC* amended statement of claim at paras. 33-49).
[65] Amended claim at paras. 96, 101, 107; original claim at para. 269, 291-292; Hamilton Affidavit, Ex. A (*Adelberg* statement of claim at paras. 1(a)(iv)-(v), 47) and Ex. B (*Dorceus SC* amended statement of claim at paras. 1(a)(i)-(ii), 45).
[66] Amended claim at para. 97; original claim at para. 285, 327; Hamilton Affidavit, Ex. B (*Dorceus SC* amended statement of claim at para. 1(e)(ii)).
[67] Amended claim at paras. 97-98; original claim at paras. 328, 331; Hamilton Affidavit, Ex. B (*Dorceus SC* amended statement of claim at para. 1(e)(ii)).

e. assertions that unspecified "vaccine passports" violate ss. 2, 6, 7, and 15 of the *Charter*.[68]

23. After successive substantially similar frivolous claims were dismissed by six different courts, it ought to have been clear to the plaintiffs that re-packaging the same claims in an amended pleading would amount to an abuse of process. Nonetheless, the plaintiffs have chosen to ignore these clear signals from the courts and produced yet another unanswerable pleading. This is an improper use of the court's resources and constitutes an abuse of process.

II. No leave to amend

24. The plaintiffs should not be granted leave to amend for three reasons

a. First, the amended claim contains numerous claims which are bound to fail and cannot be remedied via amendment, as outlined above.

b. Second, the plaintiffs have already been given an opportunity to amend their pleadings and fix the defects identified by Justice A. Ross. Providing another opportunity to amend their pleadings would serve no purpose other than delaying the inevitable and increasing costs.[69]

c. Third, the amended claim is an abuse of process. This is a factor which militates against granting leave to amend.[70]

III. Costs

25. The Province seeks $2,500 in costs payable forthwith, pursuant to Rule 14-1(1)(d) and (15). Lump sum costs are an expedient means of avoiding further submissions and litigation.[71]

Part 4: MATERIAL TO BE RELIED ON

26. The pleadings and other materials filed herein.

27. Hamilton Affidavit.

28. Such other materials as counsel may advise and this Honourable Court permits.

---

[68] Amended claim at para. 107; original claim at paras. 299, 305, 339; Hamilton Affidavit, Ex. A (*Adelberg* statement of claim at para. 1(e)) and Ex. B (*Dorceus SC* amended statement of claim at para. 1(h), (j).

[69] *H.M.B. Holdings Ltd. v. Replay Resorts Inc.*, 2019 BCSC 1138 at para. 72.

[70] *E.B. v. British Columbia (Child, Family and Community Services)*, 2021 BCCA 47 at para. 35.

[71] *Mousa v. The Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, Incorporated*, 2014 BCCA 415 at para. 34.

TO THE PERSONS RECEIVING THIS NOTICE OF APPLICATION: If you wish to respond to the application, you must, within 5 business days after service of this notice of application or, if this application is brought under Rule 9-7, within 8 business days after service of this notice of application,

(a) file an application response in Form 33,

(b) file the original of every affidavit, and of every other document, that

(i) you intend to refer to at the hearing of this application, and

(ii) has not already been filed in the proceeding, and

(c) serve on the applicant 2 copies of the following, and on every other party of record one copy of the following:

(i) a copy of the filed application response;

(ii) a copy of each of the filed affidavits and other documents that you intend to refer to at the hearing of this application and that has not already been served on the person,

(iii) if this application is brought under Rule 9-7, any notice that you are required to give under Rule 9-7 (9).

Date: July 15, 2026

Counsel for the Province
Rory L. Shaw

To be completed by the court only:

Order made

[ ] in the terms requested in paragraphs ..... of Part 1 of this notice of application

[ ] with the following variations and additional terms:

.....

.....

.....

Date: .....[*dd/mmm/yyyy*]..... .....

Signature of [ ] Judge [ ] Associate Judge

Appendix

THIS APPLICATION INVOLVES THE FOLLOWING:

[ ] discovery: comply with demand for documents
[ ] discovery: production of additional documents
[ ] other matters concerning document discovery
[ ] extend oral discovery
[ ] other matter concerning oral discovery
[ ] amend pleadings
[ ] add/change parties
[ ] summary judgment
[ ] summary trial
[ ] service
[ ] mediation
[ ] adjournments
[ ] proceedings at trial
[ ] case plan orders: amend
[ ] case plan orders: other
[ ] experts
[X] none of the above